DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 909 HE 017 818

AUTHOR	Lovett, Clara M.; And Others
TITLE	Vitality without Mobility: The Faculty Opportunities Audit.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; Northwest Area Foundation, St. Paul, Minn.; Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, New York, NY. College Retirement Equities Fund.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	44p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
JOURNAL CIT	Current Issues in Higher Education; n4 1983-1984
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Innovation; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Personnel Policy; Program Descriptions; *Questionnaires; School Community Relationship; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Audits

ABSTRACT

A faculty opportunities audit consisting of two parallel sets of questions is presented. One set is designed to help individual faculty members assess their own professional situation and relationship to their institution; the second set is designed to help faculty leaders and administrators analyze how and to what extent their institution provides an environment of opportunity for the professional growth of the faculty. The first part of the audit focuses on traditional activities (teaching, research, and service) that do not need to be legitimized in the higher education community, yet need to be rethought and reinterpreted in light of the economic, cultural, and social climate of the 1980s. The second part is designed to help faculty and administrators think about faculty activities in ways that are unconventional and that need to be legitimized in the academic community. The third part requires the participants to explore roles, activities, and uses of time that take faculty away from the home campus and into the community, whether for consulting assignments or in preparation for career transitions to nonacademic employment. Policy issues raised by the audit are identified, along with new premises for professional development. Professional development programs operating at 15 colleges or systems and at two associations are described. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

1983-84 • NUMBER 6 $5.00

CURRENT ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

AAHE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

ED249909

VITALITY WITHOUT MOBILITY:
The Faculty Opportunities Audit

AAHE Task Force on
Professional Growth

Cosponsors:
American Association for Higher Education
Northwest Area Foundation
Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AAHE
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

About AAHE

The American Association for Higher Education is a national organization of individuals joined in two related purposes: to advance the quality of American higher education and their own effectiveness as teachers, learners, and managers.

AAHE is a forum for civilized, constructive debate. It has no partisan agenda or group to represent. Issues are identified, subjected to analysis, and presented for choices.

Through AAHE, members receive a constant stream of information about issues—current and emergent—via publications, special projects and convenings, and through our National Conference on Higher Education. For membership information, write or call:

AAHE
One Dupont Circle, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-6440

About Current Issues in Higher Education

The *Current Issues in Higher Education* series has brought members a thematic set of briefing papers several times a year for many years. In the past, the series was built exclusively around papers delivered at AAHE's National Conference on Higher Education.

The 1983-84 series is a collection of "best papers"—some from the 1983 Conference, some newly commissioned, some previously published elsewhere—on issues of current significance.

This issue represents the last of the regular *Current Issues* series. In the future, AAHE will publish under that title occasional papers of special merit. In place of the series, AAHE members will automatically receive a free subscription to *Change Magazine*, published six times per year.

For a complete listing of AAHE publications, including all *Current Issues in Higher Education* titles since 1978, please write or call AAHE at the address above.

1984–85 Board of Directors

Chair:
Frank Newman, *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*
Chair-Elect:
Harriet W. Sheridan, *Brown University*
Vice Chair:
Joseph F. Kauffman, *University of Wisconsin-Madison*
Past Chair:
Paula P. Brownlee, *Hollins College*
Carlos H. Arce, *National Chicano Council on Higher Education*
Charles R. Bowen, *IBM Corporation*
David W. Breneman, *Kalamazoo College*
Anne L. Bryant, *National Association of Bank Women*
Arthur Chickering, *Memphis State University*
Kenneth E. Eble, *University of Utah*
Zelda F. Gamson, *University of Michigan*
O. B. Hardison, Jr., *Georgetown University*
Yvonne Kennedy, *S.D. Bishop State Junior College*
Arthur E. Levine, *Bradford College*
Alan Pifer, *Carnegie Corporation of New York*
W. Ann Reynolds, *The California State University*
Gloria D. Scott, *Clark College*
Gail E. Thomas, *The Johns Hopkins University*

President: Russell Edgerton
Vice President: Theodore J. Marchese
Managing Editor: Jann Teeple-Hewes

1983-84 • NUMBER 4 $5.00

CURRENT ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

VITALITY WITHOUT MOBILITY:
The Faculty Opportunities Audit

by

Clara M. Lovett, Dean, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences
The George Washington University

with the assistance of

Lloyd J. Averill, Director of Development, Continuing Education, and Community Relations, and Lecturer School of Social Work, University of Washington

Roger G. Baldwin, Assistant to the Provost
Wittenberg University

Russell Edgerton, President
American Association for Higher Education

and the Task Force on
Professional Growth

Richard T. Alpert, Associate Dean of the Faculty
Hampshire College

John M. Bevan, Executive Director
Charleston Higher Education Consortium

Janet Hagberg, President
Hagberg Associates, Minneapolis

Peggy Heim, Senior Research Officer
Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America and College Retirement Equities Fund

Richard B. Heydinger, Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Minnesota

Thomas H. Maher, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Saint Francis College, Pennsylvania

CONTENTS

Foreword . . .		1
I.	The Environment of Opportunity	3
II.	Professional Development: The New Basics	5
III.	Using the Faculty Opportunities Audit	8
IV.	Questions for Faculty	9
	Professional Growth Along Traditional Lines Professional Growth Through the Expansion of Traditional Roles Experiencing New Professional Roles	
V.	Questions for Institutional Leaders	22
	Professional Growth Along Traditional Lines Professional Growth Through the Expansion of Traditional Roles Experiencing New Professional Roles	
VI.	Reexamining Policies, Finding Resources	31
VII.	A Guide to Resources	33
	Programs in Place Selected Literature	

FOREWORD

This audit is one product of a stream of activity originating from AAHE's 1979 National Conference on Higher Education. The keynote speaker at this event, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, professor of sociology and of organization and management at Yale, challenged us to think about the age-old issues of faculty renewal from a new perspective—the reform of academic work. What was needed, she argued, was a fundamental rethinking of the nature of academic careers and the environments of opportunity within which these careers unfold.

After this conference, twelve of us met to brainstorm the issues. In time, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the Lilly Endowment came forward with support for continued exploration. Roger Baldwin joined AAHE's national office staff to direct a study of career development projects underway at colleges and universities. Roger's study, *Expanding Faculty Options*, provided the substance for an invitational meeting at the Spring Hill Conference Center near Minneapolis.

The idea for an audit was hatched at the Spring Hill conference. During one of the working group discussions, someone began lamenting the fate of reports like the one we were working on: "nothing happens." Another observed that the problem wasn't so much a matter of outright resistance to the ideas, but of inertia. Academics are very busy. Few enjoy wading into the morass of personnel policy. Then the light went on. Why don't we develop an audit of some sort which would help faculty and administrators confront these nitty-gritty issues?

Martha Butt, vice president of the Northwest Area Foundation, and Peggy Heim, senior research officer at TIAA-CREF, were present at the Spring Hill discussions and shared the group's enthusiasm for developing an audit. They encouraged their respective organizations to contribute to this effort. Six stalwarts from the Spring Hill group, listed on the title page, agreed to serve on a task force for the project. Roger Baldwin stayed on at AAHE to do the key staff work. All of us assumed that an audit would be relatively easy to design. The heart of it was to be a checklist of questions, plus an inventory of provocative ideas which would stimulate faculty and administrators to think creatively about professional growth.

Three task force meetings and some months later, we weren't very far along. Our task force meetings were inevitably lively, stimulating affairs. But what was emerging on paper were lists of questions that were invariably tedious to complete. We realized that we weren't too sure what criteria to use for including and excluding questions. We weren't sure how far the audit could go in becoming a survey which actually could be taken and scored by participating faculty and administrators on a given campus.

At about this time, Roger Baldwin moved to a new position, and we turned to Lloyd Averill for the difficult assignment of coming in cold and converting our lists and task force discussions into a workable first draft. Lloyd had thought hard about faculty development while deaning at several institutions and consulting with many others, and did a magnificent job of pulling things together, generating new information, and getting us on track. When Lloyd completed his assignment, we had a document we could give people and ask them to try out.

Armed with this draft and numerous reactions to it, we asked Clara Lovett, dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences at The George Washington University, to try her hand at a final draft. Clara was the perfect catch. She is an active scholar in her field of European history; she had chalked up administrative experience as an associate provost at Baruch College; and she had developed a "subcareer" of research and writing about faculty careers. We caught her just when she was in transition to her current position at George Washington University and had several weeks available to lend to the project.

Once into the project, Clara found the need for much original thought and work, and her contribution turned out to be quite substantial. We decided that the audit needed an introductory framework, so we jointly wrote the sections on "An Environment of Opportunity" and "The New Basics." Clara then simplified and reorganized the audit, developed separate questionnaires for faculty and administrators, and rewrote all the questions to fit this framework. She converted the implementation section from a checklist of questions into an essay format.

All of us involved now view this audit very much like I was advised many years ago to view my Ph.D. dissertation. The chair of our graduate department said to me one day: "Don't make it the best book you ever write. Just make sure it's your first."

We see this audit as a good beginning. We want to get it out and have people try it in different settings. We are unanimously enthusiastic about the *idea* of an audit, and thus we are hopeful that this version might stimulate others. We especially call your attention to the section on "Using the Faculty Opportunities Audit" where we discuss how faculty and administrators on a particular campus might develop their own custom-tailored audit, using this as a point of departure.

If interest develops, as we think it will, we would like to convene some of those who have tried it out in real

settings, and perhaps issue a second, improved edition. We can foresee a time when those experienced in its use might want to make themselves available to other institutions as consultants.

Thanks of a very special kind are owed to the task force and to the successive authors, Roger Baldwin, Lloyd Averill, and Clara Lovett. Like runners in a relay race, each made an indispensable contribution to the next in line. We are indebted to Martha Butt for her support, encouragement, and patience, and to Peggy Heim, who played a very active role on the task force and pitched in on numerous occasions when we needed a boost.

Russell Edgerton
President
AAHE

I. THE ENVIRONMENT OF OPPORTUNITY

The social forces shaping higher education in the 1980s and 1990s no longer automatically provide an environment of opportunity for professional growth. Colleges and universities, therefore, must work harder to create these opportunities themselves—and do so with fewer resources than in the past. How to do this is one of the most pressing issues in higher education.

The Legacy of the Golden Age

American higher education is much too diverse to lend itself to sensible generalization. Yet all institutions, from research institutions to community colleges, were affected by the "golden age" of expanding enrollments and rising political favor in the 1950s and 1960s. The launching of Sputnik in 1957, the gathering concern for social justice in the early 1960s, and the coming to college age of the baby boom generation in 1964 created conditions which had no parallel, before or since.

The spectacular scientific and technological race between the US and the USSR captured the public's imagination in a unique way, perhaps overshadowing other developments of equal importance. The late 1950s and early 1960s were years of unquestioned American predominance in world markets, of unprecedented opportunities for the export of American cultural products, and of increasing political and military involvement in new areas of the world.

The expansion of American influence in all these spheres seemed to require a proportionate expansion in the cadres of professional and technical workers on whose expertise the nation had come to rely. As training grounds for the "best and the brightest," colleges and universities rose to new heights of public esteem and generous financial support.

All in all, these were years of challenge and opportunity—and because opportunity was everywhere, the self-esteem, energy, and aspirations of the faculty reached new heights. By national standards, professional salaries were never very high, but neophyte professionals could take comfort in the considerable flexibility of their professional lives, the high degree of public approbation, and the near certainty of advancement through the ranks. More senior luminaries from prestige universities enjoyed the illusion, and sometimes even the substance, of power in the White House and Congress.

The widespread gains realized during this period, in turn, changed the self-image and expectations of the faculty as a profession. No longer did faculty identify with the previous generation's ideals of the gentleman/scholar living off family inheritances, or the teacher/scholar living in genteel poverty.

The intellectual differences between the faculty recruits of the 1950s and 1960s and their older colleagues were no less significant than the sociological ones. Graduate schools of the post-Sputnik era embraced wholeheartedly and somewhat uncritically some variant of the model of professional training pioneered by Johns Hopkins University. Doctoral students were taught to do research in specialized branches of knowledge and, with the passing of time, academic specialties became ever more narrowly defined.

At first, this pattern was prevalent only in the hard sciences where colleges and universities found themselves competing with industry and then with the national government for new Ph.D. graduates. But during the 1960s, the pattern became common for all academic disciplines. The nation seemed to have an inexhaustible need for specialists in all fields; they were bestowed the highest salaries and honors. The Hopkins model seemed marvelously appropriate to the national priorities of the decade. In time, undergraduate colleges of arts and sciences, and even schools of education whose raison d'etre was the practical training of teachers, were advertising for faculty "with proven research ability and a record of substantial publications."

Faculty caught up in this ethos identified strongly with their academic disciplines but felt no particular pressure to be loyal to the institutions where they were employed. Hence, the era witnessed the emergence of a new professional type, the scholar/entrepreneur, ever ready to take his or her research projects (and funds) to whatever institution offered the most satisfying working conditions or the greatest prestige.

These generalizations, we repeat, can be overdrawn. Some faculty, especially those in the community college sector, worked far from the center of gravity of the research university, and moved in other directions. But these were the dominant values, and they shaped the thinking of that generation of faculty who now occupy the tenured senior ranks at most four-year colleges and universities, and who control the discipline-based professional societies. These faculty, in short, lead higher education, and will continue to do so well into the next decade.

The Contraction of Opportunities

By the 1970s, conditions began to change. The public enchantment with science, technology, and the role of experts in national affairs turned to disillusionment. Sputnik gave way to Vietnam. Infatuation with expertise gave way to consumer protection and concern for the effects of technological change on the environment. Concern for access gave way to fears of an oversupply of college students for available jobs.

By the early 1980s, most faculty were confronting an environment in which:

- Salary increases were lagging behind the rate of inflation.
- Professional autonomy was being eroded, internally by the growth of the administrative sector, and externally by the intrusion of state and federal governments and other rule-making bodies.
- Teaching was becoming more difficult, and sometimes less rewarding, as classrooms filled with students lacking the motivation and academic preparation of previous generations.
- Professors and their institutions enjoyed less public confidence, esteem, and political support.

Most important of all, for many faculty the future no longer seemed full of choices and opportunities. For younger faculty, movement through the academic ranks was made slow, if not impossible, by high tenure ratios and delayed retirements. For young and old, the contracting academic job market meant that interinstitutional mobility—the traditional means to advancement—was no longer an option.

At the same time, trends in the broader society made mobility more difficult still. High mortgage rates, dual career families, shared custody arrangements between divorced parents, the increased number of single parent households, the growing preference for the social and cultural attractions of metropolitan areas—these and other trends reinforced the internal changes in the nature and availability of academic work.

In 1974, Robin Higham published a volume called *The Compleat Academic*. Higham's well-meaning and humorous advice on how to succeed in academe was obviously meant for a young scholar entrepreneur just out of graduate school. The "compleat academic" in the making was male, almost certainly white, certainly married, almost totally devoted to his discipline, willing, of course, to move as his career advancement required. Higham, an historian employed by a medium-sized midwestern university, knew well the mores about which he wrote; his advice to an imaginary colleague was based on twenty or more years of solid and successful professional experience. Yet his advice was already a bit dated by the time it appeared in print. By the early 1980s, it was anachronistic.

Reexamining Professional Ideals

In the past ten years, dozens of scholarly and popular works have addressed the relationship between work lives and personal lives. Much of the psychological and sociological research underlying these works has come from academe. Yet colleges and universities have been slow to incorporate such basic notions as life cycles, stages of personal power within organizations, and the integration of the personal and the professional into their personnel policies. Many institutions and individuals, however, can no longer ignore the changing social context, the need for new responses to that context, and the many reasons the one-dimensional model of a successful academic career has come under scrutiny.

In the 1970s, the greatest challenge in American higher education was to maintain vitality in scholarship and teaching with lower levels of financial support and public approbation. For the remainder of the 1980s, and probably through the 1990s, the challenge will be how to foster a climate of opportunity for personal and professional growth for faculties who are aging and whose self-images and career aspirations have become dated even before they were fully realized.

Although aware of the difficulties that lie ahead for institutions and individuals, we see no reason for pessimism and despondency. On the contrary, efforts to overcome the effects of reduced mobility may lead to a new and enlarged view of what "professional activity" consists of—and ultimately of what being a professional means. If this happens, we believe that our faculties will be more vital, and our institutions of higher education will emerge stronger than ever before.

II. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE NEW BASICS

During the heady years of postwar expansion and the Sputnik challenge, professional growth meant essentially one thing: advancing, primarily through research, in one's professional field of study. Thus, creating opportunities for professional growth involved putting in place the policies and services now deeply imbedded in the traditions of many institutions: summer leaves, sabbatical leaves, work load policies providing time for research, travel support for professional meetings and conferences, and so on.

In the late 1960s, these policies and practices continued but were also supplemented by a new concern for teaching. Several different kinds of efforts evolved. Many institutions established instructional resource centers to which faculty could turn for audio-visual equipment and other teaching aids. Offices of instructional development were established, staffed with individuals who assisted faculty to improve their teaching skills. Grant programs were begun, and leave policies liberalized, so that faculties could reengage their professional disciplines for the purposes of improving their teaching as well as their research.

These activities continued in the 1970s. No new waves rose very high, but three lesser swells could be seen. Interest in adult development focused attention on the personal, as well as the professional aspect of faculty life, and some faculty development programs veered into personal counseling. Professionals working in the field of "faculty development" became interested in the perspective of "organizational development," and focused some attention on issues such as the institutional climate and the rewards for teaching. Tight budgets and shifting enrollments forced some institutions into starting programs to retrain faculty for new specialties and sub-careers, and to counsel some faculty into wholly new careers.

The policies and services which these waves of activity have left in place have benefited faculty and institutions in many ways. We hope, to the extent possible, that they will be continued. But like the liberalism of the 1960s, they are also ideas which no longer quite fit the times. We need fresh thoughts—and to generate them, we must return to basic questions.

Professional development activities tend to assist growth along a single channel—growth in one's specialized field of interest. Put differently, the conception of growth which colleges and universities have adopted and institutionalized is that which has been defined by the professional disciplines. This generalization is truer for the institutions committed to research than it is for others. But it also holds true for many institutions whose faculty do little research. As a shorthand category, we characterize these activities as traditional opportunities for the faculty member as teacher/scholar.

We don't question the desirability of these activities. But the blunt reality is that many institutions can no longer afford them, and many faculty can no longer take full advantage of them. Sabbatical leaves are a case in point. From an institutional point of view, resources going into sabbatical leaves may not be the most effective use of the scarce resources going into professional development. From the faculty perspective, new personal circumstances may prevent taking advantage of the traditionally conceived sabbatical.

These traditional opportunities, therefore, must be pursued through more creative and flexible means. In the place of sabbatical leaves, for example, an institution might institute a more flexible policy of shortened leave periods, or mini-sabbaticals to replace the rigidity of the traditional sabbatical.

Such rethinking of new means for realizing old goals will bring new opportunities for some. But this still leaves us with a second, more fundamental problem. For some, the chief barrier to opportunity lies in the prevailing view of what roles and activities are acceptable in the first place. What many faculty need is encouragement to diversify, to move beyond the boundaries of research and teaching in their specialized fields. Many colleges, likewise, have much to gain from viewing their faculties not merely as specialists in a single field, but as a resourceful pool of talent capable of making many different kinds of contributions to the college and to society. The limiting condition, in short, lies in the narrow conception of what being a professional means. As Pogo said, "The enemy is us."

Thus, a second means of creating opportunities is to legitimate new professional roles. We do not mean by this to encourage diversity for its own sake; rather we encourage the development of new roles, thoughtfully determined by assessing individual and institutional needs and closely tied to their educational mission. The diversity we champion is diversity within an enlightened and broader conception of what professional behavior can be.

Finally, we feel that some faculty need an opportunity not only to stretch the boundaries of the traditional roles, but to move beyond the confines of the campus itself. Some of these activities might simply be an extension of traditional professional roles—e.g., consulting in one's specialized field. But we also favor engaging in projects and activities in the community outside one's specialized field of expertise, taking breaks for the purposes of getting renewed in altogether new ways, and even exploring alternative careers. We resist the notion that the only legitimate faculty career is one pursued full-time, and lockstep, on a continuing basis.

The New Basics

If we opened up our conception of professionalism, and looked afresh at creating opportunities for growth, where would this lead? We believe that it would lead to a new set of premises for professional development which are appropriate to the conditions of the 1980s and 1990s. We propose the following:

The creation of opportunities for career development must become a top institutional priority.

It is true that the vitality and quality of a college or university depends on the vitality and quality of its faculty. Under current conditions in higher education, however, vitality can no longer be taken for granted. A climate that fosters vitality must be created within the institutions themselves.

Professional growth, and its correlate, career development, often are a function of institutional projects. For instance, when a college decides to revamp its general education curriculum, commit itself to a new objective of computer literacy, or reach out to adult students, the faculty involved in such projects grow and change as a result of involvement. Indeed, most professional growth takes place in this way, not quite accidentally, but as a result of pursuing other objectives. That is why many foundations prefer to support "faculty development" activities not as an end in themselves, but as a component of curriculum development or other institutional undertakings.

However, indirect approaches to professional growth and career development by and large have failed to reach whole faculties and have failed to uncover all the questions that need to be asked about individual situations and institutional climate. Only by looking systematically and comprehensively at the environment of opportunity for the entire faculty will the right issues be raised. Recognizing this, several corporations have created Vice President for Human Resources Development positions. Colleges and universities require the equivalent.

The first key to unlocking new possibilities for professional growth is flexibility.

In the past twenty years, major changes have occurred in American culture and in the structure of the American work force. Professional workers, including faculty at colleges and universities, have changed the most. Many have working spouses and personal responsibilities, such as child rearing, which they need to take into account when making professional decisions. More importantly, their *expectations* of personal growth and fulfillment have changed. They want and feel entitled to have more personal options along with career opportunities. And, in order to obtain these, they are willing to break out of rigid social and cultural patterns and career paths that govern their lives.

In general, faculty have more autonomy and discretion than do professional workers at other institutions. But even so, the framework of institutional attitudes and policies governing faculty behavior has hardened into a system of rules that stifle rather than enhance professional and personal growth. Since the 1960s, institutional policies have tended to focus narrowly and exclusively on the technical/professional aspects of faculty life. Unique personal needs and interests have been handled, if at all, as exceptions to the general rule—and often as under-the-table exceptions. Yet in the social environment of the 1980s, personnel policies must be increasingly sensitive to the needs of the "whole person" if they are to be effective. Institutional policies must allow for the personal development of faculty members, for such development is inseparable from professional growth and career development. And all three are necessary to institutional vitality.

A flexible framework of attitudes and policies is one that treats each faculty member as a unique individual. Through flexibility, administrators can yield to the faculty the initiative to create options which make the most sense to them, while still compatible with institutional agendas. For instance, if *benefit plans* are flexible, faculty members will select those most suitable to their needs, trade off some benefits for others, and explore options such as temporary employment outside their college or university without fear of losing benefits. With flexible *work loads* faculty members could work at their own preferred pace, for instance, taking an overload one semester to earn time off in another. They could pursue their own unique strengths and interests. One might choose to concentrate on teaching (and do more of it than other departmental colleagues); another might emphasize research (with an obligation to produce results within a specified time limit). With a policy of *flexible leaves*, faculty could schedule sabbaticals or unpaid leaves in new ways, e.g., taking short "mini-sabbaticals" at more frequent intervals during their teaching careers.

The second key to unlocking new possibilities for professional growth is a larger, more generous view of the elements that add up to academic careers.

For faculty who have lost mobility and feel trapped, the sameness of their professional lives has become an issue. They need a chance to diversify, to change—at least for a while—what they do day after day. The new

insights into adult development which have resulted from the work of Erickson, Gould, Levinson, and others in recent years suggest that adult men and women pass through different stages of emotional and cognitive development and that their needs and responses to their environment differ at each stage. The lesson to be learned is that growth and change are normal and natural in adult life as well as in childhood, and that work habits and career aspirations are inevitably affected at each stage. However, most of the institutional policies and services now in place to assist the professional growth of college and university faculty are designed to let them grow in only one narrow direction, that is, to become more obviously proficient and successful in their specialized field. Of course, this is more clearly true at research universities than it is at four-year colleges. But few colleges are free from the professional model predominant at research universities. Although most college faculty do little or no research in their field of expertise, institutional policies assume that publication of research findings is tantamount to professional growth and that it is the one real key to career advancement.

The key to unlocking new possibilities is to think differently about faculty, about who they are, what they are doing, and what they can do. As a first step, we must move away from the limited and limiting view of faculty as subject matter specialists to a view of faculty as a talent bank or talent pool. As a second step, we must broaden our conception of successful academic careers to enable faculty to pursue what individual talents they have and even to take occasional breaks from their professional lives. Faculty should not be merely permitted but should be encouraged to engage in teaching and research outside their specialized field of graduate training, to undertake projects within the larger community, if they wish, and to take some time off for the purpose of renewing their intellectual and emotional resources in their own way.

The third key to unlocking new possibilities for professional growth is to find resources for faculty development even when they do not seem to exist.

More flexible institutional policies and more flexible attitudes toward faculty roles and activities can generate a climate of opportunity for professional growth. But faculty need time and money in order to take advantage of the new opportunities and translate them into forms of career development. Thus, each college or university concerned with these issues must ask itself how it can generate the necessary resources in a time of generally tight budget and competing priorities.

Inevitably, judgments will have to be made about the value of professional growth and career development vis-a-vis competing claims from faculty themselves, from students, and from other constituencies. In the long run, we believe that the return on investment of institutional resources in professional growth and career development opportunities will come in the form of a broad rethinking of academic work and therefore in alternative and more effective uses of faculty time. Institutions may experiment, for instance, with faculty appointments shared with other agencies in a given community. They may question the use of funds for traditional sabbatical leaves or routine attendance at professional meetings now that technology is making possible new ways of long-distance professional networking. They may seek financial help from outside institutions that ultimately stand to share the benefits of career development for faculty.

Finally, the best source of ideas about what needs to be done is the faculty themselves.

Top-down administrative initiatives do not have happy endings in most colleges and universities. But beyond this obvious political point is the more important reality that individual members of the faculty differ in their needs and interests. Indeed, there is evidence that as people age, they practice and enjoy the things they do well, let the other things slide, and thus become increasingly different as time goes on. Because faculty are different, what works for one will not work for another. Approaches to the task of professional growth must acknowledge these differences, as well as tap the versatility and creativity which are present.

III. USING THE FACULTY OPPORTUNITIES AUDIT

The audit which follows consists of two parallel sets of questions: one set is designed to help individual faculty members assess their own professional situation and relationship to their institution; the second set is designed to help faculty leaders and administrators analyze how and to what extent their institution provides an environment of opportunity for the professional growth of the faculty.

We encourage you to think of a continuum of possible uses of the audit, each step becoming more systematic and formal. At one end of the continuum, the audit can be a simple exercise for provoking ideas. To sit down and work through the questions is to be forced to think in concrete and practical terms about opportunities for professional development. At the other end of the continuum, the audit can be a vehicle for gathering information from groups of people, comparing their judgment, and discussing the results. Thus, the audit can be the starting point for systematic group reflection about issues of professional growth and career development. Department chairs might learn from the audit how their faculty compares with that of other departments. The audit might be administered and the results used as the basis for a faculty retreat. Chief academic officers concerned with institutional vitality might use it as a guide to assess the institutional climate. Boards of Trustees might use it as a guide to personnel policies, and so forth.

It is unlikely, of course, that these two sets of questions, although broad and general, will cover all of the unique needs of your particular institution. But you could use them as a point of departure for developing your own comprehensive audit. You could then administer your own specific instrument, and perfect it over time. Finally, you may wish to use this audit, or future revised versions, as an instrument for comparing the environment of professional opportunity on your campus with that of another "benchmark" institution. As a preliminary assessment before meetings of teams from different institutions, the audit could be very useful in stimulating practical discussions across institutions about how the common cause of professional growth might be pursued.

Organization

The first part of the audit focuses on traditional faculty activities (teaching, research, and service) which do not need to be legitimized in the higher education community, yet need to be rethought and reinterpreted in light of the economic, cultural, and social climate of the 1980s. The questions in this first part are designed to help participants think through the traditional roles and assess to what extent these have been or can be adapted to the current environment. We expect that quite a few users—those who are basically comfortable with traditional faculty roles and activities—will stop at this first stage of the audit and then go on to make adjustments—e.g., in faculty work loads or use of leave—that are creative yet still within the bounds of well established and accepted policies and procedures.

The second part takes participants a bit further afield in the exploration of what faculty are and do. At this stage, teaching faculty and administrators are asked to think about faculty activities in ways that are unconventional, if not altogether new, and that need to be legitimized in the academic community. For example, faculty are asked to explore their own feelings about and views of institutional "outreach" programs, while administrators are asked to reflect on the feasibility of changing the institutional climate and reward system in order to encourage those willing to teach at undesirable locations or inconvenient hours. The "stretching of boundaries" may prove particularly useful to institutions that are experiencing the loss of familiar constituencies and the emergence of new and different ones and also at institutions suffering from the cumulative effects of many individual mid-life crises.

Finally, the third part requires the participants to explore roles, activities, and uses of time that basically take faculty away from the home campus and into the community, whether for occasional consulting assignments, long-term shared appointments with other agencies, or in preparation for career transitions to nonacademic employment. The new options that may be uncovered at this third stage may be an answer to the special problems of institutions facing retrenchment or experiencing the much discussed "dead wood" or "burn-out" syndromes. New career options, for instance, may be a legitimate, creative, and cost-effective way for colleges and universities to cast the burden of unenthusiastic teachers and unproductive researchers while at the same time preserving for society at large a pool of intelligent and very highly educated workers.

Each part of the audit is basically self-contained, and therefore can be used independently of the others. However, we feel that the faculty opportunities audit will be most successful and useful if participants are willing to work through all sets of questions. To an extent, the inventory of institutional policies and resources that is called for at the end of the audit (see Part IV) can be useful only in the context of an inventory of unmet needs. The more information collected and analyzed about needs, the greater the chances that the audit will lead to significant changes in the institution's climate and policies.

IV. QUESTIONS FOR FACULTY

The creation of a new climate of opportunity must begin with an assessment of individual needs and aspirations for professional growth and career development. How do individual faculty members feel about the quality of their opportunities for growth? Are these compatible with the individual's aspirations? And are the professional opportunities, if any, compatible with the individual's personal development?

These are some of the questions that need to be asked at every college and university. Undoubtedly, the range of responses will be very wide, depending on the type of institution and depending on the personal and professional values of many individuals.

PART ONE
Professional Growth Along Traditional Lines

Can faculty behavior be changed? The answer lies not in manipulation of extrinsic rewards such as prizes and honors, although these should not be dismissed. Rather, the answer lies in examining the characteristics of desired faculty activities that can bring satisfaction and in creating situations in which those satisfactions can be found more readily.

Wilbert J. McKeachie
Center for the Study of Teaching and Learning
University of Michigan

The first set of audit questions is based on the assumption that professional vitality, diversity, and flexibility can be found within the framework of activities long accepted and enjoyed by faculty: teaching, research, participation in institutional governance, and discipline-related off-campus service. The questions are designed to help you assess your current activities and the actual and potential opportunities for professional development available to you within that framework.

1. Teaching

a. In your recent experience at this institution, how often have you taught your favorite course(s)?

_____ about as often as I wished
_____ not as often as I wished
_____ rarely or never

b. How often have you been assigned your favorite type of class (e.g., honors seminar, large lecture section, evening section)?

_____ about as often as I wished
_____ not as often as I wished
_____ rarely or never

c. Have you had opportunities to engage in team teaching with colleagues in your own department or interdisciplinary teaching with colleagues in other departments?

_____ yes _____ no

d. Have you had opportunities to change the content of your courses in response, for instance, to world events, national trends, or major institutional changes?

_____ yes _____ no

e. In your recent experience at this institution, have you introduced and taught new courses in your area of expertise?

_____ yes _____ no

f. Have you altered your style of teaching and experimented with, for instance, one or more of the following?

_____ experiential learning
_____ individualized instruction
_____ computers or other new technologies
_____ small group processes or learning communities

g. If you answered "no" to two or more of the previous questions, which of the following factors do you think prevented you from doing the best possible job of teaching?

_____ too many contact hours
_____ too many students in my classes
_____ inadequate financial or technical resources
_____ lack of support (or recognition) from colleagues and/or administrators
_____ lack of flexibility due to union rules
_____ pressure to do research and publish
_____ too much committee work
_____ heavy involvement in off-campus activities
_____ loss of interest in teaching generally
_____ family or personal problems
_____ other

h. Does your institution offer tangible rewards to highly effective teachers?

_____ yes _____ no

i. If not, do you think such rewards should be given?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

j. Does your institution have a program for training teaching faculty to be more effective teachers?

_____ yes _____ no

k. If not, do you think such a program should be developed?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

l. If yes, do you think the program is effective?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

m. Among the following elements, rank three that you think might contribute most to your professional development as a teacher:

_____ seminars or workshops on pedagogical techniques to be taught by in-house or guest faculty
_____ seminars or workshops focusing on interpersonal skills
_____ seminars or workshops focusing on team teaching
_____ seminars or workshops focusing on remediation of academic deficiencies
_____ videotaping of classroom sessions, followed by private viewing and one-to-one consultation with a faculty colleague
_____ informal group discussions of teaching problems
_____ informal and frequent classroom visitations by a senior colleague, followed by discussion and evaluation

_____ classroom visitations by student observers, followed by discussion and evaluation
_____ introduction of a "mentor system" for new faculty

n. Reflecting on your years at this institution, how would you rate the importance of teaching performance to your own career advancement?

_____ very important
_____ somewhat important
_____ of little importance
_____ of no importance

o. In your opinion, how much emphasis do faculty leaders and administrators at your institution place on effective teaching?

_____ excessive emphasis
_____ more than enough emphasis
_____ about the right amount
_____ not enough emphasis
_____ too little or no emphasis

p. How satisfied are you with existing opportunities for effective teaching at your institution?

_____ very satisfied
_____ somewhat satisfied
_____ somewhat dissatisfied
_____ very dissatisfied

q. How would you rate your institution's overall commitment to and support for effective teaching?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

2. Research and Publication

a. Does your institution define research and creative work as part of your professional responsibilities?

_____ yes _____ no

b. If not, do you think it should? (Please proceed to Section III)

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

c. If you answered "yes" to question a., in recent years have you worked on research projects or creative work in your field of expertise?

_____ yes _____ no

d. If not, which of the following factors have impeded your progress in this area? Please check all that apply:

_____ loss of interest in discipline and/or topic
_____ lack of adequate leave time to get to sources and/or to write
_____ lack of grant monies to purchase research materials and/or equipment
_____ lack of adequate staff support (research assistants, typists, etc.)
_____ lack of adequate equipment and/or office space and/or library resources
_____ heavy teaching load
_____ heavy commitments to institutional service
_____ financial hardship (e.g., having to moonlight to make ends meet)
_____ family or personal problems
_____ absence of support from colleagues (e.g. refining research design, critiquing manuscripts)
_____ other (please explain)

e. If yes, in recent years have any results of your work been published or exhibited in any of the following:

_____ books by trade or university presses
_____ monographic or technical series
_____ refereed journals
_____ non-refereed journals or magazines
_____ newsletters or bulletins of professional associations
_____ museums
_____ art galleries
_____ other (please explain)

f. Have the results of your research or creative work been presented orally to any of the following:

_____ international professional conferences/exhibits
_____ national professional conferences/exhibits
_____ regional or local professional conferences/exhibits
_____ in-house symposia or galleries, student groups
_____ other (please explain)

g. Have you had any experience of collaborative research or creative work with colleagues in your own department?

_____ yes _____ no

h. Have you had any experiences of collaborative work with colleagues in other departments?

_____ yes _____ no

i. If not, would you be willing to participate in collaborative projects with colleagues at your institution?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

j. In your opinion, how much emphasis do faculty leaders and administrators at your institution place on research and creative work?

_____ excessive emphasis
_____ more than enough emphasis
_____ about the right amount
_____ not enough emphasis
_____ too little or no emphasis

k. Does your institution offer tangible rewards to productive researchers and artists?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

l. If not, do you think such rewards should be offered?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

m. Among the following elements that might be included in a program of institutional support for research and creative work, rank three that you believe would contribute the most to your professional development as a scholar or artist:

_____ library/computer/studio resources
_____ word-processing facilities
_____ research assistants
_____ travel funds to work at research libraries/archives/museums
_____ seminars on grantsmanship
_____ specialized staff to help draft proposals, prepare budgets
_____ other (please explain)

n. Reflecting on your years at this institution, how would you rate the importance of research and publication or creative work to your *own career advancement?*

_____ very important
_____ somewhat important
_____ of little importance
_____ of no importance

o. How would you rate the existing opportunities for research or creative work at your institution?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

p. How would you rate the overall institutional commitment to and support for research or creative work?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

3. Service and Leadership

a. In recent years, have you served your institution in an elective or appointive capacity on your campus (e.g., department chair, faculty senate member, assistant dean)?

_____ yes _____ no

b. If yes, would you be willing to serve again in a similar capacity?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

c. If not, would you be interested in such opportunities for service?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

d. In recent years, have you served off-campus institutions such as community groups, foundations, government agencies in matters related to your academic specialty?

_____ yes _____ no

e. If yes, would you be willing to serve again in a similar capacity?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

f. If not, would you be interested in such opportunities for service?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

g. Is the process of information and consultation at your institution such that you can easily learn of opportunities for involvement?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

h. Which of the following opportunities that might accrue from on-campus service do you think are important to your professional development? Please check all that apply:

_____ input in policy formulation or implementation
_____ to serve campus community
_____ to learn about own institution
_____ to learn about higher education issues
_____ to learn management techniques and issues
_____ to interact with people in other disciplines
_____ to become better known to colleagues
_____ other (please explain)

i. Which of the following opportunities that might accrue from off-campus service do you think are important to your professional development? *Please check all that apply:*

_____ opportunity to learn about important local or national issues
_____ to serve society/community
_____ to meet other professionals
_____ to earn extra income
_____ to gain greater professional visibility
_____ to do new things
_____ other (please explain)

j. In your opinion, how much emphasis do faculty leaders and administrators place on service as a professional responsibility of the teaching faculty?

_____ excessive emphasis
_____ more than enough emphasis
_____ about the right amount
_____ not enough emphasis
_____ little or no emphasis

k. Does your institution offer recognition and/or tangible rewards to individuals who distinguish themselves in institutional service and leadership?

_____ yes _____ no

l. Reflecting on your years at this institution, which of the following factors would you say limited your opportunities for service and leadership? Please check all that apply:

_____ heavy teaching loads
_____ pressure to do research/creative work
_____ lack of interest on my part
_____ lack of institutional incentives/rewards
_____ personal or family problems
_____ other (please explain)

m. How would you rate the importance of institutional service and leadership to your career advancement?

_____ very important
_____ somewhat important
_____ of little importance
_____ of no importance

n. How would you rate the importance of the assignments you have had vis-a-vis the institutional mission?

_____ very important
_____ somewhat important
_____ of little importance
_____ of no importance

o. Overall, how satisfied were you with those assignments?

_____ very satisfied
_____ somewhat satisfied
_____ somewhat dissatisfied
_____ very dissatisfied

p. How would you rate the overall opportunities for service and leadership on your campus?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

q. How would you rate your institution's support for off-campus service related to your academic specialty?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

PART TWO
Professional Growth Through the Expansion of Traditional Roles

Though something similar may be true of other occupations, I suspect that our job as college teachers is quite unusual in the amount of room it gives for sub-careers and in the freedom it gives us to choose what sub-careers we will follow or to shift from one to another. It is probably unusual, too, in its assumption that our sub-careers will somehow influence, in a desirable way, the main business of teaching. To us, as people, these sub-careers can be wonderfully refreshing and energizing. From the outside, as my obituary will see it, I was an English teacher in 1954 and I am an English teacher today. But from the inside, it's a different life.

Conrad Hilberry
Journalist, poet, and
professor of English at
Kalamazoo College

This second part of the audit is designed for those wishing to explore the possibilities for that broader, more generous view of the academic profession to which we referred in the introduction.

You may find this part of the audit particularly useful if you are a dedicated teacher wishing to perform your role in new settings or to stretch the boundaries of your area of expertise, if you are a researcher impatient with the narrow channels of communication among scholars, or if you are eager for new service and leadership opportunities growing out of your faculty roles.

1. Teaching

a. In your recent experience at this institution, have you taught courses in your area of expertise at locations other than your home campus?

_____ yes _____ no

b. If not, would you be willing to do so?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

c. If yes, where did you teach? (please check all that apply)

_____ other college or university
_____ university or other institution abroad
_____ satellite center or weekend program of home campus
_____ community center
_____ prison or hospital
_____ government training facility
_____ corporate training facility
_____ military installation
_____ other (please explain)

d. Did you volunteer to do this kind of teaching?

_____ yes _____ no

e. Did the off-campus teaching carry extra compensation?

_____ yes _____ no

f. Did the off-campus assignment(s) require you to develop new courses or curricula?

_____ yes _____ no

g. Did the assignment(s) require you to stretch the boundaries of your disciplinary expertise?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

h. Were the students significantly different from those you taught on your home campus?

_____ yes _____ no

i. Did your teaching methodology change as the result of off-campus teaching?

_____ yes _____ no

j. In general, how do your colleagues perceive off-campus teaching assignments?

_____ highly desirable
_____ somewhat desirable
_____ somewhat undesirable
_____ wholly undesirable

k. In general, do administrators at your institution encourage teaching faculty to seek unconventional assignments?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

l. Does your institution reward in any way those faculty who seek such assignments?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

m. Do you think the institution *should* reward such faculty?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

n. Reflecting on your own experience in unconventional settings, which of the following aspects would you describe as positive (please check all that apply):

_____ relationship with program administrators
_____ innovative curriculum
_____ collegial atmosphere
_____ convenient class schedules
_____ pleasant physical surroundings
_____ quality of students
_____ opportunities for team teaching
_____ opportunities to meet nonacademic professionals
_____ opportunities to contribute directly to community/society
_____ other (please explain)

o. Reflecting on your own experience, which of the following aspects would you describe as negative (please check all that apply):

_____ relationship with program administrators
_____ nature of the curriculum (e.g. too rigid, too experimental, lacking rigor, etc.)
_____ absence of appropriate collegiality
_____ inconvenient class schedules
_____ excessive travel time
_____ unpleasant or dangerous physical surroundings
_____ unprepared students
_____ other (please explain)

p. How would you rate your current opportunities for teaching assignments in new settings?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

q. In recent years, have you taught courses outside your area of special expertise?

_____ yes _____ no

r. Were the courses related in some way to your area of advanced training (e.g., if you are a biologist by training, did you branch out into such areas as ecology or biostatistics)?

_____ yes _____ no

s. Were the courses related to your faculty responsibilities, but not to your academic specialty (e.g., as a teacher of mathematics, did you branch out into educational psychology or cognitive theories)?

_____ yes _____ no

t. Does your institution offer training opportunities for faculty wishing to broaden their area of teaching competence?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

2. Research and Publication

a. Does your institution define research or creative work as part of your professional responsibilities?

_____ yes _____ no

b. If not, do you think it should? (Please proceed to Section III.).

_____ yes _____ no

c. If yes, in recent years have you engaged in research projects or creative work at this institution?

_____ yes _____ no

d. Does your institution encourage dissemination of research findings or creative work via specialized scholarly journals, monographs, and books?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

e. Does your institution encourage dissemination to broader audiences via newspaper columns, articles in community group newsletters, corporate publications, and the like?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

f. If yes, have you participated in this broader form of dissemination?

_____ yes _____ no

g. If not, would you be interested in doing so?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

h. How does your institution view the application of faculty research or creative capabilities in off-campus settings (e.g., collaborative research, internships, consulting, temporary employment)? (please check all that apply)

_____ prohibits
_____ discourages
_____ permits
_____ encourages
_____ facilitates
_____ rewards
_____ requires
_____ other (please explain)

i. Would you favor a change in your institution's attitude/policies?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

j. If you have participated in discipline-related off-campus activities, which of the following aspects of your experience do you rate as positive (please check all that apply):

_____ opportunities for collaborative research/creative work
_____ access to good research facilities/equipment/studios
_____ opportunities to meet nonacademic experts
_____ opportunities to contribute directly to community/society
_____ personal growth
_____ greater professional visibility
_____ other (please explain)

k. Which aspects of your experience do you rate as negative (please check all that apply):

_____ little intellectual challenge
_____ activities took too much time
_____ conflict with on-campus duties
_____ lack of support from departmental colleagues
_____ lack of support from administrators
_____ conflict with personal values/beliefs
_____ other (please explain)

l. How would you rate your current opportunities for involvement in discipline-related off-campus activities with the support of your institution?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

m. In recent years, have you done research or engaged in creative work outside your original field of advanced training?

_____ yes _____ no

n. If yes, was the work related to your main academic specialty?

_____ yes _____ no

o. Was it related to your function(s) at your institution (e.g., undergraduate teacher or advisor, department chair, member of task force)?

_____ yes _____ no

p. How would you rate your institution's rewards for faculty who develop subspecialties related to their main academic specialty?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

q. How would you rate your institution's rewards for faculty who develop subspecialties related to their on-campus functions (e.g., a department chair may acquire expertise in adult counseling)?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

3. Service and Leadership

a. In recent years, have you had opportunities to apply knowledge or skills derived from your academic discipline to service roles within your institution?

_____ yes _____ no

b. If yes, have you served your institution in roles not usually associated with faculty service, for example:

_____ internal consultant
_____ librarian
_____ book store manager
_____ computer center director
_____ grants or contracts officer
_____ labor negotiator
_____ other (please explain)

c. If not, how interested are you in unconventional opportunities for on-campus service?

_____ very interested
_____ somewhat interested
_____ slightly interested
_____ not interested

d. In recent years, have you had opportunities to apply knowledge or skills derived from your academic discipline to service roles off campus?

_____ yes _____ no

e. If yes, have you served in any of the following roles:

_____ media/public relations consultant
_____ management consultant
_____ economic development advisor
_____ city planning commissioner or advisor
_____ corporate training consultant
_____ government agency intern or consultant
_____ project director for professional association
_____ advocate for consumer, educational, environmental, civil rights, etc. issues
_____ other (please explain)

f. If not, how interested are you in opportunities for discipline-based off-campus service?

_____ very interested
_____ somewhat interested
_____ slightly interested
_____ not interested

g. Overall, how would you rate the opportunities currently available to you for unconventional forms of discipline-based service, whether on campus or off campus?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

h. How does your institution view discipline-based off-campus service?

_____ prohibits
_____ discourages
_____ permits
_____ encourages
_____ facilitates
_____ rewards
_____ requires
_____ other (please explain)

PART THREE
Experiencing New Professional Roles

Consulting . . . can be the means by which a professor nibbles into a new career. While not dramatic, I hazard the guess that, combined with internships, consulting provides the means by which one percent of the professoriate annually changes careers without any special fanfare or notice. This form of crisis prevention deserves much more attention and is probably more effective than all of the colored parachutes which people try to unfurl while in trauma over the need for a new career.

George Schurr
Academy of Senior Professionals
Eckerd College
St. Petersburg, Florida

This part of the audit is designed to assist you to think about a variety of possible new professional roles that might arise from a broad, flexible view of academic life. You may find it especially interesting if you are a senior faculty member with a record of substantial achievement in traditional faculty activities, yet unwilling to work full-time at those activities and eager for a wider range of work and life experiences. You may also benefit from this part of the audit if you are thinking of a possible career change because you are dissatisfied with academic life generally or because your institution is facing stagnation, program cutbacks, or retrenchment.

a. If you had a variety of professional options, would you prefer to:

_____ remain at your present institution with little or no change in duties
_____ remain at your present institution with significant change in duties
_____ move to another institution
_____ move to nonacademic employment

b. If you chose the second option, which of the following changes in your present duties would you consider welcome?

_____ more classroom teaching
_____ more involvement with students outside the classroom
_____ more training or mentoring of faculty
_____ more research/writing/creative work
_____ more administrative work
_____ more media/public relations work
_____ more external consulting, community service, etc.
_____ other (please explain)

c. How long would you want this redistribution of your work load to last?

_____ less than one year
_____ one to five years
_____ more than five years
_____ until my retirement
_____ until I leave the institution

d. Among your current duties at your institution, are there some that you might be willing to give up completely? _____ yes _____ no

Please describe:

e. Among your current duties at your institution, are there some that you feel particularly comfortable with?

_____ yes _____ no

Please describe:

f. How satisfied are you with opportunities currently provided by your institution to concentrate on what you do best?

_____ very satisfied
_____ somewhat satisfied
_____ somewhat dissatisfied
_____ very dissatisfied

g. Which of the following skills do you think you could most profitably apply to problems at your institution or off campus?

_____ conceptual/analytical
_____ investigative
_____ managerial/organizational
_____ writing/communication
_____ interpersonal
_____ other (please explain)

h. Are there roles at your institution for which these abilities would be an asset?

_____ yes _____ no

Please specify:

i. Are there off-campus roles in which you might like to use these abilities, if given the opportunity to do so?

_____ yes _____ no

Please specify:

j. What institutional obstacles stand in the way of such applications of your abilities? For example:

_____ colleagues' attitudes
_____ restrictive leave policies
_____ non-transferable retirement or other benefits
_____ legislative or contractual requirements
_____ other (please explain)

k. Do you think your institution should reward activities related to your overall professional experience but not necessarily to your academic specialty?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

l. How does your institution view the development of faculty "subcareers" unrelated to their main academic specialties?

_____ prohibits
_____ discourages
_____ permits
_____ encourages
_____ facilitates
_____ rewards
_____ requires
_____ other (please explain)

m. How would you rate your own long-term prospects for developing such "subcareers"?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

V. QUESTIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL LEADERS

Institutional leaders include administrators (e.g., academic vice presidents, deans) as well as faculty (e.g., department chairs, and chairs of special task forces and committees) who must consider issues of professional growth from the "corporate" perspective. The questions presented here are roughly parallel to the questions posed to individual faculty members, but the list is less comprehensive. With regard to the parallel questions and summary judgments at the end of each section, we encourage you to *compare* your responses to the responses given by individual members of your faculty.

PART ONE
Professional Growth Along Traditional Lines

This first set of audit questions assumes that professional vitality, diversity, and flexibility can be found within the framework of activities long accepted and enjoyed by the faculty: teaching, research, participation in institutional governance, and discipline-related off-campus service. We ask that you think of ways in which professional growth might be enhanced by a more creative and flexible approach to these activities.

1. Teaching

a. In your opinion, how much emphasis does your institution place on effective teaching when making personnel decisions?

_____ excessive emphasis
_____ more than enough emphasis
_____ about the right amount
_____ not enough emphasis
_____ too little or no emphasis

b. Does your institution offer tangible rewards to highly effective teachers?

_____ yes _____ no

c. Do you think such rewards should be given?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

d. In general, do you think colleges and universities should have programs to train teaching faculty to be effective teachers?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

e. Which of the following elements do you think should be included in a training program? (please check all that apply)

_____ seminars or workshops on pedagogical techniques to be taught by in-house or guest faculty
_____ seminars or workshops focusing on interpersonal skills
_____ seminars or workshops focusing on team teaching
_____ seminars or workshops focusing on remediation of student's academic deficiencies
_____ videotaping of classroom sessions, followed by private viewing and one-to-one consultation with a faculty colleague
_____ informal group discussions of teaching problems
_____ informal and frequent classroom visitations by a senior colleague, followed by discussions and evaluations
_____ classroom visitations by student observers, followed by discussion and evaluations
_____ introduction of a "mentor system" for new faculty
_____ seminars or workshops on the use of computers in instruction

f. How satisfied do you think the teaching faculty at your institution are with existing opportunities for effective teaching?

_____ very satisfied
_____ somewhat satisfied
_____ somewhat dissatisfied
_____ very dissatisfied

g. How satisfied do you think the teaching faculty at your institution are with overall teaching conditions (schedules, classrooms, students, etc.)?

_____ very satisfied
_____ somewhat satisfied
_____ somewhat dissatisfied
_____ very dissatisfied

h. How would you rate the existing opportunities for effective teaching at your institution?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

2. Research and Publication

a. Does your institution define research and creative work as part of the teaching faculty's professional responsibilities?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

b. If not, do you think it should? (Please proceed to Section III)

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

c. If you answered "yes" to question a., which of the following factors, in your opinion, inhibit faculty productivity in this area? (please check all that apply)

_____ individual faculty member's loss of interest in discipline and/or topic
_____ lack of adequate leave time to get to sources and/or to write
_____ lack of grant monies to purchase research materials and/or equipment
_____ lack of adequate staff support (research assistants, typists, etc.)
_____ lack of adequate equipment and/or office space and/or library resources
_____ heavy teaching load
_____ heavy commitments to institutional service
_____ financial hardships (e.g., having to moonlight to make ends meet)
_____ personal or family problems
_____ absence of support from colleagues (e.g. refining research design, critiquing manuscripts)
_____ other (please explain)

d. Does your institution encourage collaborative research and creative work?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

e. In your opinion, how much emphasis does your institution place on research and creative work?

_____ excessive emphasis
_____ more than enough emphasis
_____ about the right amount
_____ not enough emphasis
_____ too little or no emphasis

f. Does your institution offer tangible rewards to productive researchers and artists?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

g. If not, would you be willing to introduce such rewards?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

h. Among the following elements that might be included in a program of institutional support for research and publication, rank three that you consider most important to the professional development of the faculty:

_____ small grants, requiring simple application procedures
_____ word-processing facilities
_____ research assistants
_____ travel funds to attend professional conferences
_____ travel funds to work at research libraries, archives, etc.
_____ seminars on grantsmanship
_____ specialized staff to review draft proposals, prepare budgets, etc.
_____ other (please explain)

i. Reflecting on your years at this institution, how would you rate the importance of research and creative work to the career advancement of individual faculty members?

_____ very important
_____ somewhat important
_____ of little importance
_____ of no importance

j. How satisfied do you think the teaching faculty at your institution are with overall support of their research and creative work?

_____ very satisfied
_____ satisfied
_____ somewhat dissatisfied
_____ very dissatisfied

k. How would you rate the opportunities for research and creative work at your institution?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

3. Service and Leadership

a. Does your institution define service and leadership as important professional responsibilities of the teaching faculty?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

b. Do you think it should?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

c. If you answered "yes" to question a., how much emphasis does your institution place on service and leadership?

_____ excessive emphasis
_____ more than enough emphasis
_____ just about the right amount
_____ not enough emphasis
_____ little or no emphasis

d. Does your institution offer recognition and/or tangible rewards to individuals who distinguish themselves in institutional service and leadership roles?

_____ yes _____ no

e. If not, do you think the institution should offer such rewards?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

f. Reflecting on your years at this institution, how would you rate the importance of service to the career advancement of members of the teaching faculty?

_____ very important
_____ somewhat important
_____ of little importance
_____ of no importance

g. In general, how interested do you think the teaching faculty are in opportunities for service and leadership on campus?

_____ very interested
_____ somewhat interested
_____ slightly interested
_____ uninterested

h. In general, how interested do you think the teaching faculty are in opportunities for service and leadership off-campus, in roles related to their academic expertise?

_____ very interested
_____ somewhat interested
_____ slightly interested
_____ uninterested

i. How would you rate the opportunities for service and leadership on your campus?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

j. How would you rate your institution's support for off-campus service related to the faculty's academic specialties?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

k. Reflecting on your overall experience at this institution, how would you rate the institutional commitment to provide opportunities for the professional development of the faculty in their traditional role requirements of teaching, research/creative work, and service?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

l. Do you think that additional opportunities can and should be created through more imaginative and flexible use of institutional resources?

_____ yes _____ no

Please explain:

PART TWO
Professional Growth Through the Expansion of Traditional Roles

In this set of questions, we direct your attention to the need to view faculty members as a diversely talented "resource pool," and to adopt a broad and generous view of what constitutes worthy professional activitity. We ask that you look hard at institutional attitudes, policies, and procedures which might be unnecessarily constricting the range of activities which faculty members are capable of performing.

1. Teaching

a. Does your institution provide opportunities for teaching in new settings, whether on or off campus?

_____ yes _____ no

b. Do you think your institution should offer such opportunities?

_____ yes _____ no

c. If you answered "yes" to question a., where are your faculty members teaching? (please check all that apply)

_____ other college or university
_____ university or other institution abroad
_____ satellite center or weekend college of home campus
_____ community center program
_____ prison or hospital
_____ government training facility
_____ corporate training facility
_____ other (please explain)

d. On what basis are teaching faculty chosen for such programs? (please check all that apply)

_____ volunteer
_____ rotational among department members
_____ length of service (junior faculty first)
_____ length of service (senior faculty first)
_____ special skills
_____ low enrollment in courses on home campus
_____ other (please explain)

e. Does nontraditional and/or off-campus teaching carry extra compensation?

_____ yes _____ no

f. In general, how do you think faculty perceive existing opportunities for nontraditional assignments?

_____ highly desirable
_____ somewhat desirable
_____ somewhat undesirable
_____ wholly undesirable

g. In general, does your institution encourage faculty to teach in new settings?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

h. Does your institution reward in any way those faculty who seek such assignments?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

i. Do you think the institution should offer such rewards?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

j. How would you rate your faculty's current opportunities for teaching in new settings?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

k. Does your institution offer training opportunities for faculty who wish to broaden their area of teaching competence?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

l. Which of the following training opportunities do you think would be helpful to faculty on your campus? (please check all that apply)

_____ reduced teaching loads
_____ sabbatical leaves
_____ financial incentives
_____ exemption from research and/or service obligations during additional training
_____ tuition support for additional study
_____ other (please explain)

m. Does your institution reward faculty who volunteer to teach outside their field of special expertise?

_____ yes _____ no ___ not sure

n. If not, do you believe it should?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

o. How would you rate your faculty's current opportunities to broaden their areas of teaching competence with the support of the institution?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

2. Research and Publication

a. Does your institution define research and creative work as part of the teaching faculty's professional responsibilities?

_____ yes _____ no

b. Do you think it should?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

c. Does your institution encourage dissemination of research findings or creative work via specialized scholarly journals, monographs, and books?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

d. Does your institution encourage dissemination to broader audiences via newspaper columns, articles in community group newsletters, corporate publications, and the like?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

e. How does your institution view the application of faculty research or creative abilities to areas not usually associated with faculty activities (e.g., bookstore management, personnel matters, budget projections, public relations)?

_____ prohibits
_____ discourages
_____ permits
_____ encourages
_____ facilitates
_____ rewards
_____ requires
_____ other (please explain)

f. How does your institution view the application of faculty research or creative capabilities in off-campus settings (e.g., collaborative research, internships, consulting, temporary employment)? (please check all that apply)

_____ prohibits
_____ discourages
_____ permits
_____ encourages
_____ facilitates
_____ rewards
_____ requires
_____ other (please explain)

g. Would you favor a change in institutional attitude/policies?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

h. Which of the following factors do you think might motivate faculty to become involved in unconventional discipline-related activities? (please check all that apply)

_____ opportunities for collaborative research/creative work
_____ access to good facilities/equipment/studios
_____ opportunities to meet nonacademic experts
_____ opportunities to contribute directly to community/society
_____ personal growth
_____ greater professional visibility
_____ other (please explain)

i. Which of the following factors would you say discourage or prevent faculty from becoming involved in unconventional discipline-related activities? (please check all that apply)

_____ little intellectual challenge
_____ activities take too much time
_____ conflict with on-campus duties
_____ lack of support from departmental colleagues
_____ lack of support from administrators
_____ conflict with personal values/beliefs
_____ other (please explain)

j. How would you rate your faculty's current opportunities for involvement in such activities with the support of the institution?

5 4 3 2 1
excellent very poor

k. In general, how interested do you think your faculty are in broadening their research or creative efforts outside their original fields of advanced training?

_____ very interested
_____ somewhat interested
_____ slightly interested
_____ uninterested

l. Would your institution provide support for members of your faculty who wish to develop subspecialties related to their main academic specialty and/or to their functions on campus?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

3. Service and Leadership

a. How interested do you think your faculty are in opportunities for traditional forms of faculty service (e.g., department chair, member of Faculty Senate, assistant dean)?

_____ very interested
_____ somewhat interested
_____ slightly interested
_____ uninterested

b. Which of the following abilities do you think teaching faculty can gain by serving in the institutional governance and administrative structure? (please check all that apply)

_____ ability to work with others
_____ organize projects
_____ prepare and present reports
_____ manage staff
_____ manage funds
_____ "see the big picture"
_____ negotiate with outside agencies
_____ other (please explain)

c. Does your institution offer opportunities for service and leadership in areas not traditionally associated with faculty governance (e.g., manager of physical plant or bookstore, labor negotiator, ombudsman, consultant, chair of special project task force)?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

d. How interested do you think your faculty are in unconventional opportunities?

_____ very interested
_____ somewhat interested
_____ slightly interested
_____ uninterested

e. Does your institution encourage faculty to apply abilities and experience gained from institutional service to off-campus problems?

_____ yes _____ no _____ not sure

f. In general, how interested do you think the faculty at your institution are in opportunities for off-campus service?

_____ very interested
_____ somewhat interested
_____ slightly interested
_____ uninterested

PART THREE
Experiencing New Professional Roles

In this third set of questions, we ask you to find out how you and your faculty feel about crossing the boundaries into unconventional opportunities for professional growth. Then we ask you to consider how institutional attitudes, policies, and procedures might be modified so as to accommodate those faculty who would like to explore such options.

a. If your faculty had a variety of professional options, do you think they would prefer to:

_____ remain at your institution, with little or no change in current duties
_____ remain at your institution, with significant change in duties
_____ move to another institution
_____ move to nonacademic employment

b. If a significant percentage of your faculty were to choose the second option in the question above, which of the following changes in duties do you think they would opt for?

_____ more classroom teaching
_____ more involvement with students outside the classroom
_____ more training or mentoring of faculty
_____ more research/writing/creative work
_____ more administrative work
_____ more media/public relations work
_____ more external consulting, community service, etc.
_____ other (please explain)

c. How satisfied do you think your faculty are with existing opportunities to concentrate on what they do best?

_____ very satisfied
_____ somewhat satisfied
_____ somewhat dissatisfied
_____ very dissatisfied

d. Are there on-campus roles not usually performed by faculty which might be opened to those who express an interest?

_____ yes _____ no

Please explain:

e. In your opinion, what percentage of your faculty might want to apply their teaching and/or research and/or leadership skills to off-campus assignments?

_____ 10 percent or less
_____ 10 to 25 percent
_____ 25 to 50 percent
_____ 50 to 75 percent
_____ 75 percent or more

f. If you answered 25 percent or more, what arrangements do you think your institution should make to enable faculty to do this? (please check all that apply)

_____ none; it should be an individual responsibility
_____ help identify opportunities for nonacademic assignments
_____ grant unpaid leave to faculty wishing to explore those opportunities
_____ grant sabbatical leave for nonacademic service
_____ cost-share with the host institution
_____ arrange for some faculty to hold joint appointments with nonacademic institutions
_____ other (please explain)

g. In your opinion, how often (or on what basis) would interested faculty want to perform unconventional roles? (please check all that apply)

_____ on a temporary basis, full-time
_____ on a temporary basis, part-time
_____ on a permanent basis, full-time
_____ on a permanent basis, part-time
_____ with a permanent commitment to your institution
_____ with possibility of leaving your institution at some future date
_____ as preparation for leaving voluntarily by a specified date
_____ as preparation for involuntary separation from your institution
_____ other (please explain)

h. In general, how satisfied do you think the faculty at your institution are with existing opportunities for unconventional roles sponsored or encouraged by your institution?

_____ very satisfied
_____ somewhat satisfied
_____ somewhat dissatisfied
_____ very dissatisfied

VI. REEXAMINING POLICIES, FINDING RESOURCES

The results of the audit will raise questions and spark controversy about many attitudes, policies, and procedures. Of necessity, those charged with analyzing the results and implementing change will have to be selective in their choice of issues to be pursued. These issues will vary according to the mission, size, and location of the institution, the composition of its faculty, and so forth. Nevertheless, certain broad questions will have to be raised at all participating institutions and some areas of faculty professional life are certain to stand out more than others. In the following pages we have attempted to anticipate some of the broad questions and to provide examples of the truly critical professional issues likely to be highlighted by the audit.

Reexamining Policies

1. Clarity

To address any of the issues raised by the audit, both existing and proposed personnel policies must be clearly articulated and understood. In assessing the clarity of your institution's policies, the following questions may be useful:

- Does your institution have written policies and procedures concerning faculty professional activities?
- If so, are they distributed to all faculty members?
- Is there an orientation program for new faculty?
- Is there a mentoring system with senior faculty providing junior faculty with information and guidance?
- Is there an established procedure whereby the faculty (e.g. Faculty Senate) or individuals may initiate changes in existing policies and procedures?

2. Consistency

Audit results may suggest that written policies and procedures are basically rigid and not conducive to a greater variety of professional roles for faculty. If this is the case, faculty leaders and administrators may wish to take a close look at unwritten practices and compare them with the written rules. Several questions might be raised at this point:

- Are there significant and frequent exceptions to the written rules (e.g., special teaching schedules to accommodate personal needs, flexible uses of leave, etc.)?
- If so, how have they occurred? Have they been publicized on campus? What was faculty reaction?
- Could the exceptions become the basis for new, formal policies? How?

3. Responsibility

A number of questions must be asked about who will be responsible for what in creating a new environment of opportunity:

- At your institution, who is responsible for reshaping personnel policies within a framework of greater flexibility? What is their status?
- Is/are the person(s) responsible for this important area well known and respected by the faculty?
- Is the faculty large enough, and are the problems complex enough, to warrant the appointment of a full-time person to formulate new policies and provide leadership toward implementation of a career development program?
- If such positions already exist, or seem justified, what is/should be the relationship between these individuals and the academic departments or other institutional units where crucial decisions about faculty careers are made?
- To what extent and in what ways are top administrators and respected senior faculty involved in the implementation of career development programs?
- To what extent and in what ways are department chairs involved in the program? What can be done to broaden the responsibilities and strengthen the role of the department chairs?

4. Assessment

The notions of professional growth and development of new roles for faculty imply a process of continuous and conscientious assessment of individual performance. This process is essential for the profession, the institution, and the individual faculty member. The professoriate requires rigorous assessment of individual members in their professional capacities if it is to stand high in public esteem. The institution requires effective evaluation of faculty members if it is to keep the faith of the clients it serves and the patrons who support it. Most importantly, the individual faculty member is entitled to the benefits of a rigorous, yet constructive, assessment by his or her peers at every stage of professional development. Most institutions, however, lack procedures for continuous assessment of individual faculty members, particularly tenured ones, or have been lax in implementing them. Regardless of how the audit turns out, institutions need to examine their assessment policies and procedures. These are some of the questions that might be raised on the subject:

- Does your institution have policies and procedures for the systematic evaluation of faculty, including those with tenure? Do the evaluations occur periodically and frequently after the achievement of tenure?
- Are the criteria used in the evaluation based on a prior statement of professional obligations, or on objec-

tives set forth in a "faculty growth contract"?
• Where the evaluation takes more traditional forms, are the results discussed with the faculty member? Do the procedures lead to specific objectives to help guide the faculty member's professional development?
• Are the objectives of the evaluation limited to subjects relating to traditional roles of faculty, such as improvement of teaching, or do they provide opportunity for the expansion and enrichment of a person's career?
• If continuous assessment procedures are already in place, what can be done to improve them? If they are not in place, what can be done to develop them?

5. Leaves, Retirements, and Work Loads

Once these general questions have been addressed, depending on the results of the audit, each participating institution will have to focus on specific policy areas. It may be enough to focus on three or four important issues. In our view, the successful reshaping of a few key policies (e.g., work loads, retirement options, etc.) will set in motion a process of overall change and renewal. The following general questions may be useful in a variety of situations:
• Should leave policies be reexamined? If so, what have been the traditional uses of leave without pay and sabbatical leave?
• If leaves have been granted primarily for the pursuit of research projects, should changes be made to accommodate a wider range of professional activities?
• Should retirement policies be reexamined?
• Are faculty now expected to shift from full-time commitment to complete separation from the institution? Can we think more creatively about retirement?
• Can the role of professor emeritus be updated and redefined to include faculty on phased retirement plans or faculty returning to the campus part-time after beginning new careers elsewhere?
• Are shared appointments with other departments, other colleges, nonacademic institutions, etc., viable alternatives to early retirement or retrenchment?
• Should work load policies be reexamined?
• Are work load policies such that individual faculty members enjoy maximum flexibility while accomplishing the institutional mission?
• Are there ways to encourage flexibility in work loads through enhanced collegiality at the department level?
• Are there ways to free the faculty from the common (and largely dysfunctional) obligation to perform on three counts as teachers, researchers, and leaders?
• Are there creative ways to legitimize role specialization so as to get maximum institutional benefits from individual strengths?

Finding the Resources

After identifying the areas of greatest institutional need, those charged with implementing audit results will want to address the issue of resource allocation. Here again, each participating institution will have to find specific solutions. But the following questions will almost certainly have to be asked:
• Will funds for professional growth activities (e.g., sabbaticals for retraining, unpaid nonacademic internships) have to be raised within the institution itself?
• If so, are there resources to be captured by shifting funds, for instance, from courses with very low enrollment or from low-priority administrative services to a "pool" for mini-sabbaticals?
• Are there ways of doing traditional and necessary things less expensively? For instance, could audio-conferencing substitute for professional travel by several faculty members and administrators? Could a typing pool equipped with word processors reduce the need for departmental typists?
• Are there probable sources of external funding? Faculty development programs have received seed money from private foundations and government agencies. Recently, however, as national priorities have shifted, these potential sources of aid have been less promising than they were in the mid-1970's. Are there creative ways of linking the continuing need for faculty development with the new priorities, especially the current concern with the quality of undergraduate education?
• In addition to the "obvious" sources of external funding, are there sources specific to a geographical area, a discipline, a type of college?
• Are there "in-kind" contributions that might be solicited from corporations (e.g., use of computers, conference facilities, services of a management consultant)?
• Are there possibilities for mutually beneficial exchanges between a college and a nonacademic institution (e.g., the services of a journalism instructor, a psychologist, or an historian, in exchange for the services of a software specialist)?

VII. A GUIDE TO RESOURCES

Programs in Place

AUSTIN COLLEGE
Sherman, Texas

Institutional Profile: Liberal arts focus
Independent
1,200 students

A faculty career development program was established in 1973 under the direction of then Acting Dean A. J. Carlson. A particularly interesting feature of the Austin program is the individual career development plan for each participating faculty member.

• Professors can prepare a career development plan at their own initiative or at the request of the divisional dean. Often the decision to draft a new plan comes at the "end of the year" conference between the faculty member and his or her dean.

• Preparation of an individual plan is usually begun during the spring term and completed and approved by the end of the fall term. The process typically requires three interviews: a preliminary conversation about the professor's goals; a review of a preliminary draft of the development plan; and a final conversation based on the completed plan.

• A retired professor of educational psychology was selected for the counseling role. The career development advisor is completely removed from the administrative line management structure, so that professors feel free to talk with her or him about development ideas they are not yet ready to discuss with their deans. A career advisor is available in each of the three divisions of the College—Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences.

BEREA COLLEGE
Berea, Kentucky

Institutional Profile: Liberal arts and professional study focus
Independent
1,600 students

With the support of Dean of the College William Stolte, Berea encourages its faculty members to extend their professional lives beyond the confines of their academic disciplines. Two week summer seminars on interdisciplinary themes broaden professors' liberal arts education and prepare them to participate in the College's four core courses. Half year leaves for study outside their fields of specialization also help prepare Berea faculty to teach interdisciplinary courses.

THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
Charleston, South Carolina

Institutional Profile: Liberal arts focus
State supported
5,600 students

A faculty development program was established in 1976 under the leadership of Academic Vice President John M. Bevan. Major program objectives are: to make professors aware of professional development opportunities; to assist professors in the quest for outside funding for research, teaching, and other professional projects; to help professors (often in non-monetary ways) design development projects and "retool" their competencies; and to stimulate faculty interaction and awareness of one another's professional accomplishments, off campus as well as on campus.

The college has put in place a variety of mechanisms to expand faculty career opportunities. Among the most provocative are:

• *Small grants* for research, teaching improvement, or other forms of professional development activity;
• *In-house fellowships* providing released time from routine duties to permit faculty members to concentrate on particular strengths or interests;
• *Cross-departmental teaching* enabling professors to widen the scope of their academic careers by teaching in other fields where they have an interest and some expertise;
• *Administrative internships* to broaden specific skills and permit experimentation with the possibility of a move into higher education administration;
• *Support for consulting* that is clearly beneficial to teaching. In some cases, funds are available to help professors enhance their consulting skills;
• *Career change assistance* for those who wish to leave the College. Funds are not available to train for a career change, but the College will help a faculty member prepare resumes and make employment contacts.

The College of Charleston is flexible with its faculty career development resources. The goal is to provide faculty members with a combination of funding, services, and opportunities to facilitate their continuing professional growth.

CONCORDIA COLLEGE
Moorhead, Minnesota

Institutional Profile: Liberal arts college
Independent
2,500 students

Concordia College maintains a Faculty Center to facilitate faculty development at the institution. Under the guidance of Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean David Gring and several faculty representatives, the College offers a range of opportunities for professors to expand their pro-

fessional careers beyond customary activities and roles. They include:

• *Flexible sabbaticals*. Professors may use sabbatical leaves to meet a range of professional objectives. In addition to traditional research and writing projects, they may use the time to retrain for new responsibilities at the College.

• *Summer workshops*. The College offers one or two-week faculty sessions focused on specific development themes. Some workshops promote interdisciplinary growth, others address professors' personal needs such as adult development and retirement planning.

• *Faculty all-college lectures*. Two professors are selected each year from departmental nominations to give a lecture to the general campus community.

• *Faculty forums*. "Brown bag" lunches scheduled 10 to 12 times a semester feature a presentation by a faculty member on a subject of current interest. Priority is given to those returning from sabbatical or conducting sponsored research.

• "*Teaching at Concordia.*" This annual publication chronicles faculty activities and achievements and reports on professors' research, recitals, exhibits, and community service. Three or four departments and eight to ten faculty members are profiled each year.

• *Phased retirement*. Faculty members between 60 and 65 may reduce their workload to two-thirds time or less. Salary and benefits are adjusted but rank and tenure are retained.

DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Dallas, Texas

Institutional Profile: Seven campus community college district
Programs in arts and sciences, business, technology, and professional fields

An administrative internship program, coordinated by the vice chancellor for academic affairs, provides a growth option for DCCC faculty members. Instructors may participate in an internship to develop specific skills and knowledge, to experiment with administrative work, or just to experience a change of scene. The internships:

• Are designed by the participant and by the unit in which he or she wishes to work. This strategy assures an experience responsive to the faculty member's development goals.

• Include four workshops on management procedures covering information crucial to successful administration.

• Are part-time and concurrent with ongoing faculty responsibilities.

EARLHAM COLLEGE
Richmond, Indiana

Institutional Profile: Liberal arts focus
Quaker
1,200 students

The core of Earlham's faculty development program was developed in the mid-1970's under the leadership of then Provost Joe B. Elmore. Key features of this program are:

• *Assessment* of tenured faculty at five-year intervals.

• *A Professional Development Fund*. A committee chaired by the Provost administers and allocates professional growth funds and solicits ideas and proposals from the faculty.

• *A Consultant on Teaching*. A senior faculty member serves for two years as a confidential consultant available to faculty to provide assistance with syllabi, classroom visits, and counseling sessions.

• *A Teaching and Learning Committee*. A standing faculty committee provides opportunities for discussing teaching problems and acts as a resource group to all members of the teaching faculty.

• *Flexible Faculty Appointments*. By hiring teachers for interdisciplinary programs, granting tenure to part-time faculty, etc., the college encourages maximum flexibility in faculty career development.

• *Retirement options*. Various types of phased retirement plans are available.

FIVE COLLEGES, INC.
Amherst, Massachusetts

Institutional Profile: Consortium comprised of four independent liberal arts colleges—Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, Smith—plus the University of Massachusetts
Located within 30 minutes of each other

Under the direction of Coordinator E. Jefferson Murphy, Five Colleges, Inc. has a history of successful interinstitutional cooperation. Sharing facilities and jointly sponsoring activities have enabled the member institutions of Five Colleges, Inc. to enrich their educational programs. Cooperative faculty projects, likewise, enhance the work lives of professors employed by the five institutions. These include:

• *Faculty exchanges*. One-for-one exchanges between departments, released-time borrowing (where the receiving institution reimburses the supplying institution), and less formal exchanges such as team teaching and guest lecturing are options available to professors at each of the five institutions.

• *Faculty seminars*. Faculty with complementary interests set up periodic seminars to discuss articles, hear guest speakers,

and report on work-in-progress. Some seminars have a traditional disciplinary focus; many are interdisciplinary.

• *Joint projects*. Cooperative faculty activity sometimes moves beyond discussion jointly sponsored programs. Collaborative projects in areas such as Black Studies, Women's Studies, and Applied Mathematics have won external financial support. Curricular revisions, conferences, and publications have resulted as well.

GREAT LAKES COLLEGES ASSOCIATION
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Institutional Profile: Consortium of 12 midwestern liberal arts colleges
More than 100 new faculty hired among the institutions each year
23-year history of cooperation in academic programs and faculty development

In 1983, the Great Lakes Colleges Association established a program to support the career development of new faculty members. The initiative recognizes that new college professors generally experience a difficult transition period which is now complicated by uncertain opportunities for tenure and career advancement. The GLCA program, coordinated by Vice President Neil Wylie, includes:

• *Conferences and workshops* addressing such topics as the nature of faculty careers in small colleges, the teaching process, the intellectual and moral development of students, redefining faculty workloads, and seeking tenure and promotion. At these meetings, veteran faculty and administrators from the member colleges help new professors consider a range of issues pertinent to the academic career.

• *Informal mentoring relationships* linking junior and senior colleagues who share the same disciplinary or other academic interests. The objective is to help novice and veteran professors exchange ideas concerning teaching and scholarship, engage in cooperative professional activity, and facilitate one another's career growth.

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
Normal, Illinois

Institutional Profile: University
State supported
20,000 students

Illinois State offers a wide range of career services to faculty through its Faculty Career Development Center. The Center is currently directed by Donald Cochran. Special features of Illinois State's Faculty Career Development Program include:

• *Individual career consultation*. Professors may request assistance in clarifying their long-term goals, identifying development resources, and planning strategies to advance their careers. The confidential consultation occurs on neutral territory, because the Center is not involved in faculty evaluation. Hence, professors feel free to recognize their professional weaknesses and development needs.

• *Educational leaves*. Faculty members, in consultation with their dean and department chairperson, may design and receive funding for an educational leave plan. Educational leaves are used to help faculty develop new areas of teaching competence in response to changing enrollment patterns within the University. However, educational leaves may also be used by professors who wish to prepare for careers outside of higher education.

KANSAS CITY REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
Kansas City, Missouri

Institutional Profile: Consortium of 17 institutional members including community colleges, junior colleges, a college of arts and design, and several independent liberal arts colleges.

Under the leadership of President Larry Rose, KCRCHE pools the resources of its member institutions in support of faculty development. Jointly sponsored activities that stimulate professors' career growth include:

• *Academic discipline group meetings*. These periodic meetings bring together instructors from the same teaching field to discuss research, teaching strategies, and other issues of common concern. The meetings expand the colleague support group of professors from small departments.

• *Scholar networking*. A KCRCHE directory includes information about the research and scholarly interests of professors at the consortium's member institutions.

• *Development services*. Personal development seminars and career development workshops help faculty members to prepare for changing circumstances in their families and professional lives. Topics have included stress management, interpersonal effectiveness, and clarification of career goals.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Chicago, Illinois

Institutional Profile: University comprised of ten schools
Roman Catholic
15,000 students

In the late 1970s, Loyola University recognized that traditional faculty development opportunities were not adequate

to meet the personal and professional needs of faculty in a period of restricted options for career advancement. Under the direction of philosophy professor Dr. Robert Barry, the University established a multidimensional Career Development Program for faculty and administrators. Some features of the program include:

- *Workshops* on the interaction of personal and professional goals, skills assessment, time management, financial management, dual career marriages, and stress prevention.
- *A small grants fund* supporting activities to enhance professors' career advancement.
- *Placement assistance* for faculty who wish to take a temporary position in a business, government agency, or other non-academic organization. The Program also assists professors who wish to arrange a teaching exchange with another institution or with another academic unit at Loyola.

MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Phoenix, Arizona

Institutional Profile: Seven-campus system with professional and technical focus
Public
63,000 credit students and 55,000 non-credit students

A Human Resources Master Plan was developed in 1981-82 under the leadership of Ronald W. Bush, vice chancellor for employee relations. The plan called for the establishment of a Vice Chancellor for Human Resources position, which, at this writing, had not yet been filled. Features of the Maricopa Plan are:

- *Early retirement options*. Unlike similar efforts elsewhere, this part of the Maricopa Plan was designed by the employees themselves and is viewed as a career option rather than as a means to force older faculty to leave. Faculty may retire at age 60 while protecting major benefits until age 70. A variety of phased retirement options are available.
- *Extended leave options*. Faculty may take up to three years of leave. The time may be used to update expertise, explore other career options, rest, etc.
- *Flexible benefits*. This part of the plan was designed by District employees to tailor a package of benefits to individual needs instead of group needs. The District is also experimenting with non-traditional benefits (e.g., auto insurance, home computers, legal aid).

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
De Kalb, Illinois

Institutional Profile: Liberal arts and professional focus
Public
Over 25,000 students

An Office of Faculty Development was opened in January 1982 under the supervision of the provost. A significant feature of the NIU program is the development of individual plans for professional growth. When approved, these plans receive institutional support in the form of released time from teaching, transportation costs for study at nearby institutions, etc.

POMONA COLLEGE
Claremont, California

Institutional Profile: Liberal arts college belonging to the Claremont Colleges group
Independent
1,400 students

A program of funded study leaves at Pomona College helped faculty members broaden their areas of expertise or try out new academic fields. The program supplemented traditional faculty development opportunities such as sabbaticals which usually emphasize study and research in a professor's established area of specialization. The purpose of a study leave was to help a faculty member find new sources of ideas and new contexts in which to explore them.

Study leaves at Pomona were tailored to the needs of the individual professor. The basic requirements were:

- Identification of a program or plan of study.
- Designation of a study mentor to work with the faculty member.
- Outline of the eventual benefits of the project to the individual and to Pomona.

The study leave program is no longer in operation. Contact the dean's office for information.

REGIS COLLEGE
Denver, Colorado

Institutional Profile: Programs in liberal arts and administrative sciences
Roman Catholic
2,800 students

The mid-career change incentive program of Regis College perhaps represents the most far reaching effort to expand the career opportunities open to college professors. For some faculty, the Regis program makes career change a viable option. According to Dean for Campus Programs William Hynes, tenured members of the Regis faculty who have served the College for 10 or more years may choose to voluntarily yield tenure to enter a non-academic career and qualify for:

- Their regular salary and benefits for no more than one year plus receive a $3,000 redirection grant.

OR

- Three years of compensatory salary to make up the difference in income between one's former academic post and a new, lower paying position.

• Faculty career changers and their family members remain eligible for tuition remission benefits for three years. They also become "Faculty Alumni" and remain within a network of people closely tied to the College.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Lawrence, Kansas

Institutional Profile: University with 11 schools and colleges
State supported
Over 24,000 students

The University of Kansas has implemented a creative variation of the traditional faculty exchange. The Intra-University Visiting Professorship Program, coordinated by Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Sally Sedelow, enables mid-career faculty members to spend one year teaching and taking courses outside of their home department or school. The objective is to renew professors' careers by exposing them to new challenges and helping them expand their knowledge and skills. Intra-university exchanges present fewer logistical problems than do off-campus academic exchanges. Also, internally exchanged faculty members become acquainted with new resources and colleagues that can be of importance after they return to their regular academic positions.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
Madison, Wisconsin

Institutional Profile: System consists of 13 universities and 14 university centers
State supported
Central office coordinates policy development and distributes funds

Support for faculty retraining has been available at the University of Wisconsin since the mid-1970s. According to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Dallas Peterson, faculty retraining is a key portion of the System's total program for faculty development and renewal. Professors usually prepare to work in fields closely allied to their original disciplines. Under the guidelines of Wisconsin's policy:
• Retraining projects may be individual or group efforts.
• Costs are covered by matching funds from a professor's home institution and the System office.
• Funds may be requested for salary support, tuition, costs of workshops and institutes, travel and living expenses.
• Retraining faculty are encouraged to take courses within the Wisconsin System.
• Approval of a retraining plan is dependent on the need within the University System for the skills and expertise to be developed.

WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY
Springfield, Ohio

Institutional Profile: Liberal arts focus
Independent
2,200 students

The Faculty Development Organization (FDO) of Wittenberg University seeks to enhance educational quality by enriching the professional lives of faculty members. FDO aids professors who wish to diversify their careers by funding the following:
• *New course development.* This program enables faculty members to pursue evolving professional interests by enlarging their repertoire of courses. Grants may be used to buy books, develop course materials, or attend seminars. FDO gives preference to proposals for team-taught interdisciplinary courses.
• *Faculty redirection.* Grants are awarded to retrain faculty in academic or administrative areas where their matured interests have led them. Professors may also use redirection funds to prepare for a career change outside of the academic profession. FDO gives highest priority to redirection proposals which respond to institutional needs as well as to the personal career interests of the faculty member.

Selected Literature

The Post-Sputnik Era

Caplow, Theodore and McGee, Reece J. *The Academic Marketplace*. New York, Basic Books, 1958. Classic sociological study of the academic profession in the age of expansion.

Higham, Robin F. *The Compleat Academic*. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1974. A manual on how to succeed in the academic profession. Despite the publication date, it describes the social context of the profession in the late 1960's.

Van den Berghe, Peter. *Academic Gamesmanship*. New York, Abelard-Schuman, 1970. A cutting, but not frivolous, view of the scholar/entrepreneur of the 1960's.

The Social and Cultural Context of the 1980's

Arbeiter, Solomon et al. *40 Million Americans in Career Transition*. New York, The College Board, 1978. Discusses data of a survey of adults undergoing or about to undergo career change. Emphasizes the need for planning and information.

Cherniss, Cary. *Professional Burnout in Human Services Organizations*. New York, Praeger, 1980. Advances the theory that burnout is a predictable condition of professionals who have to interact daily with human beings and their many problems. Not written with academics in mind, yet useful to stimulate thinking about teaching careers.

Gardner, John. *Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society*. New York, Harper Colophon, 1965. Discusses the need for organizations to facilitate ongoing self-renewal.

Gould, Roger L. *Transformations: Growth and Change in Adult Life*. New York, Touchstone, 1978 A psychiatrist's view of the challenges and process of adult development.

Hagberg, Janet O. *The Inventurers: Excursions in Life and Career Renewal*. Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley, 1977. Case studies of risk-takers.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. *The Change Masters: Innovation for Productivity in the American Corporation*. New York, Simon & Schuster, 1983. Imaginative and thought-provoking; should be read as a companion piece to Peters and Waterman's book (see below).

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York, Basic Books, 1977. A landmark work detailing the benefits of opportunities for career growth.

Keller, George. *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983. Overview of major changes in the structure of higher education since the 1960's.

Ladd, Everett Carll, Jr. and Lipset, Seymour M. *Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education*. Berkeley, CA, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1973. Pioneer study of the implications of collective bargaining on the academic profession.

Levinson, Daniel J. *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. New York, Knopf, 1978. Based on a ten-year study of adult life cycles. Emphasizes (in contrast to Freudian theories) stages of growth and development in adult life.

Patton, Carl V. *Academia in Transition*. Cambridge, MA, Abt Books, 1979. One of few research-based works on the possible impact of mid-career change and early retirement on steady-state faculties.

Peters, Thomas J. and Waterman, Robert H., Jr. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best Run Companies*. New York, Harper & Row, 1982. A best-selling book that probes the secrets of successful business firms. Notable for its application of university-generated psychological and sociological theories about incentives, job satisfaction, interpersonal relations, etc.

Ricklefs, Roger. "Publish or Perish? Professors Discover Perishing is Simpler," *The Wall Street Journal*, May 25, 1979. Brief, but raises important questions about the predominance of the research university model in higher education.

Faculty Development: Ideas and Experiments

Austin, Ann E. and Gamson, Zelda F., *Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report #10, 1983. A useful survey of the literature on colleges and universities as workplaces, and the work experiences of faculty and administrators.

Baldwin, Roger G. et al. *Expanding Faculty Options. Career Development Projects at Colleges and Universities*. Washington, DC, AAHE, 1981. Survey of several projects begun in the mid-1970's.

Baldwin, Roger G. and Blackburn, Robert T., *College Faculty: Versatile Human Resources in a Period of Constraint*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1983. Strategies for using higher education's faculty resources more effectively.

Bergquist, William H. and Phillips, Steven R. *A Handbook for Faculty Development*. Washington, DC, Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975-1981, 3 vols. Case studies, with suggestions for faculty leaders and administrators.

Bevan, John M. "Faculty Evaluation and Institutional Rewards." *AAHE Bulletin*, October 1980. Raises important questions about incentives in academic work.

Centra, John A. *Determining Faculty Effectiveness*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1982. Provides theoretical insights and practical advice on evaluation of faculty as a first step in development plans.

Furniss, W. Todd. *Reshaping Faculty Careers*. Washington, DC, American Council on Education, 1981.

Houle, Cyril O. *Continuing Learning from the Professions*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980. A study of 17 different professions and of the process of lifelong learning. Has important implications for professional growth of college and university faculty.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss et al. "Perspectives on Leadership." *Current Issues in Higher Education #1*, Washington, DC, AAHE, 1979. Strengths and weaknesses of academic patterns of leadership contrasted with those of corporate and other institutions.

Ladd, Everett Carll, Jr. et al. "Faculty Career Development." *Current Issues in Higher Education, #2*, Washington, DC, AAHE, 1979. Theoretical insights, research-based reports, practical examples from a variety of institutions.

Lewis, Darrell R. and Becker, William E., Jr. *Academic Rewards in Higher Education*, Cambridge, MA, Ballinger, 1979. A critical look at the prevailing reward systems.

Nelsen, William C. and Siegel, Michael E. *Effective Approaches to Faculty Development*. Washington, DC, Association of American Colleges, 1980. Less than the title suggests, but a useful collection of essays on experiments at small institutions. Focus is primarily on teaching.

Schurr, George M. *Freeing the "Stuck" and Aiding the Terminated: Expanding the Career Horizons of Tenured College Professors*. Report commissioned by the Ford Foundation, January 1980. Unpublished and privately distributed.

Current Issues in Higher Education

Copies of the 1979 through 1983 *Current Issues in Higher Education* are available individually or in sets, at the prices shown, below. 25 or more copies of a single title may be purchased at a 25% discount. To prices listed add 15% postage/handling charge. All orders under $25 must be prepaid. Make checks payable to AAHE and mail to AAHE Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036; 202/293-6440.

1983-84 Series—*Complete set $15.*

1. Colleges Enter the Information Society *($4.00)*
Entering the Information Society: An Introduction—*Russell Edgerton* • The Computer: An Enabling Instrument—*Louis Robinson* • Liberal Education in the Information Age—*George Gerbner* • Academic Practices, Freedom, and the New Technologies—*Ithiel de Sola Pool* • The Library: Center of the Restructured University—*Patricia Battin* • The Post-Gutenberg University—*Steven Muller*

2. Computers on Campus: Working Papers *($4.00)*
Edited by Marc S. Tucker—Information Technology: Instruction is the Issue • The "Star Wars" Universities: Carnegie-Mellon, Brown, and M.I.T. • Instruction and the Computer

3. Writing Across the Curriculum *($4.00)*
Writing Across the Curriculum: What's at Stake?—*Barbara Leigh Smith* • The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing—*Maxine Hairston* • An Interview with Elaine Maimon—*Barbara Leigh Smith* • What Works: The Problems and Rewards of Cross-Curriculum Writing Programs—*Christopher Rideout* • Writing Across the Curriculum: An Annotated Bibliography—*Charles A. Bergman*

4. Vitality Without Mobility: The Faculty Opportunities Audit *($5.00)*
A special "audit" designed to enable campus leaders to think about practical, creative, low-budget ways to expand opportunities for faculty members.—AAHE Task Force on Professional Growth—Cosponsored by American Association for Higher Education, Northwest Area Foundation, and Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association

1982-83 Series—*Complete set $6.*

1. Underprepared Learners *($4.00)*
Can Higher Education Be Equal and Excellent Too?—*K. Patricia Cross* • More than a Definitional Problem—*Darrel A. Clowes* • Quality and the Open-Door Community College—*Robert H. McCabe* • The Miami-Dade Breakthrough—*K. Patricia Cross* • Underprepared Students at Public Research Universities—*Martin A. Trow*

2. Liberal Learning and Career Preparation *($4.00)*
Liberal Learning and Career Preparation: An Introduction—*Mary Ann F. Rehnke* • The Economy and the College Student—*W. Ed Whitelaw* • Careers, Competencies, and Liberal Education—*H. Bradley Sagen* • Creating a Career Preparation Program: A Political Approach—*John J. Agria* • Career Advising for Liberal Arts Students: Faculty Roles—*David R. Hiley* • 61 Career Preparation Programs for Liberal Arts Students

1981 Series—*Complete set $15.*

1. High School/College Partnerships *($3.50)*
High School/College Partnerships that Work—*Ernest L. Boyer* • High School/College Cooperative Programs—*Michael O'Keefe* • Humanities for the High Schools—*Gale K. Crowe* • Building a High School-to-College English Curriculum: The Queens English Project—*Janet R. Brown* • Quality and Equality in the High School Curriculum: A College Board Study—*George H. Hanford*

2. Creating an Integrated Curriculum—The "Higher" in Higher Education *($3.50)*
What is 'Higher' about Higher Education?—*Harlan Cleveland* • Curricular Integration: Mortar for the Ivory Tower—*Mary Jim Josephs* • Integrative General Education: The Saint Joseph's Model—*John Nichols* • An Integrative Program for Building Skills: The City and the Self—*Susan Gurewitsch*

3. Partnerships with Business and the Professions *($3.50)*
New Frontiers for Higher Education: Business and the Professions—*K. Patricia Cross* • A Role for Colleges in Corporate Training and Development—*Ernest A. Lynton* • Partnerships in Continuing Education for Professionals—*Philip A. Nowlen and Milton R. Stern*

4. Part-Time Faculty in Colleges and Universities *($3.50)*
Overview—*Thomas A. Emmet* • Who Are the Part-Timers and What Are Colleges Doing for Them?—*Howard P. Tuckman and Barbara H. Tuckman* • The Legal Position of Part-Timers—*John Andes* • Faculty Development for Part-Timers—*Richard Bagwell and Ione Elioff*

5. New Technologies for Higher Education *($3.50)*
Overview—*Raymond J. Lewis, Jr.* • What Makes a Telecourse?—*Rodger A. Pool* • Curriculum Issues in Telecommunications—*Adele F. Seeff* • Administration Issues in Telecommunications—*Marlowe Froke* • Adapting to the Computer Revolution—*John H. Strange*

1980 Series—*Complete set $15.*

1. Improving Teaching and Institutional Quality *($3.00)*

2. Funding Quality Improvement: Lessons from the FIPSE Experience *($3.00)*

3. Differing Perspectives on Declining Faculty Salaries *($3.00)*

4. New Models for General Education *($3.00)*

5. Integrating Adult Development Theory with Higher Education Practice *($3.00)*

6. Strategies for Retrenchment: National, State, Institutional *($3.00)*

1979 Series—*Complete set $11.*

1. Perspectives on Leadership *($2.50)*

2. Faculty Career Development *($2.50)*

3. Premises of Federal Student Assistance *(available only as part of complete set)*

4. Employment Priorities in Academe *($2.50)*

5. Assessment *($2.50)*

6. Tenure *($2.50)*

7. The Changing Character of the Academic Work-force *(available only as part of complete set)*